

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

In the drawings

Revised Figs. 3 and 4 are shown in the "Replacement Sheets" of drawing appended herewith. Figs. 3 and 4 have been revised by adding a reference number 35 to identify the inner wall 35 which defines the air channel 32.

In the specification

The specification has been amended to provide literal antecedent basis for amendments to the claims, by adding a description of the inner wall 35 which defines the air channel 32. It is respectfully submitted that the inner wall 35 is clearly depicted in the figures as defining or forming the air channel 32, and therefore no new matter is added.

Rejection of claims 1-3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3 and 6 presently stand rejected as being anticipated by Mayer (U.S. 4,399,484). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the present invention. The amended claim 1 recites a main body having an airflow channel piercing through the main body from a top surface to a bottom surface thereof, wherein the airflow channel is formed by an inner wall extending from the top surface to the bottom surface of the main body, and a supporting device disposed on the bottom surface of the main body. Support for the inner wall extending from the top surface to the bottom surface of the main body and defining (forming) the airflow channel is found in Figs. 3 and 4 of the present application, and the specification has been amended to provide literal antecedent basis for the amended claim.

It is respectfully submitted that Mayer anticipate claim 1 of the present application because Mayer does not disclose or suggest an airflow channel that is formed by an inner wall that extends from the top surface of the main body to the bottom surface of the main body. “A claim is anticipated *only if each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” (emphasis added) Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The *identical invention* must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” (emphasis added) Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

With reference to Mayer’s specification and figures, Mayer discloses a cooling system that includes a housing 10 with plural circuit boards 20 therein. The circuit board 20 further comprises plural electronic components 21 and plural holes 22 defined in the circuit boards. The cover plate 11 is fixed on the housing 10 by screws 12. Inlet openings 14 and the exhaust openings 17 are disposed on the end plates 15 and 16 of the housing 10. A coolant flow may be connected to the housing 10 by flanges 18 to provide airflow, from a source such as a pump, blower fan, or the like (col. 3, lines 12-17). Therefore the coolant flow, shown as the coolant flow lines 30 in Fig. 1 from the inlet openings 14, can pass through the holes 22 in one circuit board and impinge onto the electronic components 21 on the successive downstream circuit board 20 directly as shown in Fig. 2 so as to dissipate the heat generated from the electronic components 21 (Col. 3, lines 53-66).

Thus, it can be recognized that cooling airflow is not confined within a air channel extending from the top surface of the main body to the bottom surface of the main body. Moreover, there is no inner wall defining such an air channel. On the contrary, such an air channel, defined by an inner wall to guide air from the top surface of the main body to the bottom surface of the main body is counter to the method of operation of Mayer’s cooling system wherein it is explicitly taught that air is to impinge directly onto electrical components inside the housing.

In the present invention, airflow through the main body is confined within the air channel by the inner wall. Because the air channel is vertical, extending from the top

surface of the main body to the bottom surface of the main body, air flows by convection from the bottom of the main body, upward through the air channel (within the inner wall which can also be considered an air duct) and out the top of the main body. Thus, a convective air flow provides cooling, without the need for forced air from a pump, fan, or the like.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Mayer does not anticipate claim 1 of the present invention, and that therefore claim 1, and the dependent claims 2-6 and 8 are allowable over the cited reference. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore requested.

Rejection of claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4 and 5 presently stand rejected, claim 4 being rejected as unpatentable over Mayer, and claim 5 being rejected as unpatentable over Mayer in view of Chuang (U.S. 2004/0095713). These rejections are respectfully traversed. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Mayer. It is respectfully submitted that Chuang fails to supplement the above cited deficiencies of Mayer, and therefore claims 4 and 5 are allowable for the reasons cited above. Withdrawal of these rejections is therefore requested.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1-6 and 8 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: January 3, 2006



JOHN R. SCHAEFER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,921